



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/020,779	12/14/2001	Scott R. Swix	36968.265393 (BS01377)	9532

7590

04/20/2006

Scot Zimmerman  
P O Box 3822  
Cary, NC 27519

EXAMINER

VAN BRAMER, JOHN W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/020,779

Applicant(s)

SWIX ET AL.

Examiner

John Van Bramer

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1-6, 8, 9, 11-15, and 17-20.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 9, 11-15 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8, 9, 11-15 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 120105, 120605.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. The amendment filed on February 20, 2006 cancelled claims 7, 10, and 16. Amendments were made to claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-15, and 17-20. No new claims were added. Thus, the currently pending claims addressed in this Office Action are 1-6, 8, 9, 11-15, and 17-20

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marsh et al. (U.S. Patent Number: 5,848,397).

Claim 1: Marsh discloses an advertisement management method, comprising:

- a. Scheduling programming content that includes an advertisement time slot for a first advertisement. (Col 7, lines 40-52)
- b. Inserting an advertisement into the advertisement time slot. (Col 7, lines 40-52)
- c. Categorizing the advertisement as at least one of: an overrideable advertisement and a non-overrideable advertisement, wherein the

overrideable advertisement is replaceable with another advertisement,  
and wherein the non-overrideable advertisement is not replaceable and  
will be delivered as scheduled. (Col 12, lines 7-64)

- d. Receiving a request from an advertiser to replace any overrideable  
advertisement with another advertisement. (Col 8, line 47 through Col 9,  
line 20; and Col 9, lines 65 through Col 10 line 20)
- e. Determining whether the advertisement is categorized overrideable. (Col  
12, lines 7-64)
- f. If the advertisement is categorized as an overrideable advertisement, then  
replacing the advertisement with another advertisement. (Col 12, lines 7-  
64)

Claim 3: Marsh discloses the method of claim 1, wherein an overrideable  
advertisement is priced at a lower cost than a non-overrideable advertisement.  
(Wherein the first advertisement is a public service advertisement with a  
NO\_PRIORITY status)(Col 8, lines 49-62 and Col 13, lines 8-39)

Claim 4: Marsh discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the request to replace the  
advertisement with the another advertisement is based upon data obtained using  
ratings system technology that tracks program viewing activities for the purpose of  
identifying most-valuable and least-valuable potential customers. (Col 15, line 31  
through Col 16, line 12)

Claim 5: Marsh discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising broadcasting the scheduled programming content, including the another advertisement, to potential consumers. (Col 8, lines 47-62)

Claim 6: Marsh discloses the method of claim 5, wherein broadcasting the scheduled programming content comprises at least one of: broadcasting the scheduled programming content as a television broadcast, broadcasting the scheduled programming content as a radio broadcast, and broadcasting the scheduled programming content over a network. (Col 8, lines 47-62)

Claim 8: Marsh discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the request to replace the advertisement is based upon data obtained using marketing tools comprising at least one of: rating systems that track program viewing activities by sampling a plurality of households and estimating the number of viewers of the programs using viewing activity data, focus groups that study the effectiveness of different types of advertisements, and product sales reports. (Col 15, line 31 through Col 16, line 1)

Claim 9: Marsh discloses an advertisement management method, comprising:

- a. Scheduling programming content that includes an advertisement time.

(Col 7, lines 40-52)

Art Unit: 3622

- b. Inserting a first advertisement into the advertisement time slot, such that the first advertisement is scheduled for broadcast delivery. (Col 7, lines 40-52)
- c. Categorizing the first advertisement as one of: an overrideable advertisement and a non-overrideable advertisement, wherein the overrideable advertisement is replaceable with another advertisement, and wherein the non-overrideable advertisement is not replaceable and will be delivered as scheduled. (Col 12, lines 7-64)
- d. Receiving at a server a request from an advertiser to replace the scheduled first advertisement with a second advertisement. (Col 8, line 47 through Col 9, line 20; and Col 9, lines 65 through Col 10 line 20)
- e. Determining whether the scheduled first advertisement is categorized as overrideable. (Col 12, lines 7-64)
- f. If the first advertisement is categorized as overrideable, then replacing the first advertisement with the second advertisement. (Col 12, lines 7-64)

Claim 12: Marsh discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising pricing an overridable advertisement at a lower cost than a non-overrideable advertisement. (Wherein the first advertisement is a public service advertisement with a NO\_PRIORITY status) (Col 8, lines 49-62, and Col 13, lines 8-39)

Art Unit: 3622

Claim 13: Marsh discloses the method of claim 9, wherein receiving the request to replace the first advertisement with the second advertisement is based upon data obtained using ratings system technology that tracks program viewing activities for the purpose of identifying most-valuable and least-valuable potential customers. (Col 15, line 31 through Col 16, line 12)

Claim 14: Marsh discloses the method of claim 9, further comprising broadcasting the scheduled programming content including the second advertisement. (Col 8, lines 47-62)

Claim 15: Marsh discloses the method of claim 14, wherein broadcasting the scheduled programming content comprises at least one of: broadcasting the scheduled programming content as a television broadcast, broadcasting the scheduled programming content as a radio broadcast, and broadcasting the scheduled programming content over a network. (Col 8, lines 47-62)

Claim 17: Marsh discloses a system for managing advertisement programming, comprising:

- a. A processor communicating with memory; wherein the processor schedules programming content that includes an advertisement time slot.  
(Col 7, lines 40-52)

Art Unit: 3622

- b. The processor inserts an advertisement into the advertisement time slot.  
(Col 7, lines 40-52)
- c. The processor categorizes the advertisements as at least one of an overrideable advertisement and a non-overrideable advertisement, wherein the overrideable advertisement is replaceable with another advertisement, and wherein the non-overrideable advertisement is not replaceable and will be delivered as scheduled. (Col 12, lines 7-64)
- d. The processor receives a request from an advertiser to replace any overreable advertisement with another advertisement. (Col 8, line 47 through Col 9, line20; and Col 9, lines 65 through Col 10 line 20)
- e. The processor determines whether the advertisement is categorized as overrideable. (Col 12, lines 7-64)
- f. If the advertisement is categorized as an overrideable advertisement, then the processor replaces the advertisement with the another advertisement.  
(Col 12, lines 7-64)

Claim 20: Marsh discloses the system of claim 17, wherein the processor broadcasts the scheduled programming content including the another advertisement. (Col 13, line 55 through Col 14, line 22)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:



Art Unit: 3622

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al (U.S. Patent Number: 5,848,397).

Claim 2: Marsh discloses the method of claim 1, wherein various advertisements are given a priority status (e.g., HIGH, MEDIUM, LOW, NO) wherein the NO priority assignment can be a public service advertisements which are typically cost free (Col 8, lines 49-62 and Col 13, lines 8-39). However, Marsh does not explicitly state that these priorities are based upon the cost of an advertisement. Marsh also discloses a mechanism for sorting the advertisements that fall within each assigned priority queue (Col 12, lines 7-64). The sorting criteria includes such factors as length of time the advertisement is to run and the number of exposures an advertisement is to receive. These criteria have historically been linked with the cost of and advertisement. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow an advertiser to pay a premium to replace the overrideable advertisement. One would have been motivated to set up a priority status based upon cost in order to allow the advertisement time slot provider the ability to maximize revenue for a given time slot based upon market demands.

Art Unit: 3622

Claim 11: Marsh discloses the method of claim 9, wherein various advertisements are given a priority status (e.g., HIGH, MEDIUM, LOW, NO) wherein the NO priority assignment can be a public service advertisements which are typically cost free (Col 8, lines 49-62 and Col 13, lines 8-39). However, Marsh does not explicitly state that these priorities are based upon the cost of an advertisement. Marsh also discloses a mechanism for sorting the advertisements that fall within each assigned priority queue (Col 12, lines 7-64). The sorting criteria includes such factors as length of time the advertisement is to run and the number of exposures an advertisement is to receive. These criteria have historically been linked with the cost of an advertisement. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the advertiser to pay a premium to replace the overrideable advertisement. One would have been motivated to set up a priority status based upon cost in order to allow the advertisement time slot provider the ability to maximize revenue for a given time slot based upon market demands.

Claim 18 and 19: Marsh discloses the system of claim 17, wherein various advertisements are given a priority status (e.g., HIGH, MEDIUM, LOW, NO) wherein the NO priority assignment can be a public service advertisements which are typically cost free (Col 8, lines 49-62 and Col 13, lines 8-39). However, Marsh does not explicitly state that these priorities are based upon the cost of an advertisement. Marsh also discloses a mechanism for sorting the advertisements that fall within each assigned priority queue (Col 12, lines 7-64). The sorting criteria includes such

factors as length of time the advertisement is to run and the number of exposures an advertisement is to receive. These criteria have historically been linked with the cost of an advertisement. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the advertiser to pay a premium for an advertisement to replace the overrideable advertisement. One would have been motivated to set up a priority status based upon cost in order to allow the advertisement time slot provider the ability to maximize revenue for a given time slot based upon market demands.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6 Applicant's arguments filed February 20, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- a. The applicant argues that Marsh et al. (U.S. Patent Number: 5,848,397) does not teach "overrideable" and "non-overrideable" advertisements. While the Marsh does not use the exact terms "overrideable" and "non-overrideable", he does teach the prioritizing of advertisements based upon scheduling criteria. The Marsh disclosure then schedules these advertisements based upon their assigned priority queue and priority value. The examiner is considering an overrideable advertisement to be one that can be replaced by another with a higher priority, and Marsh specifically describes such replacement (Col 10, line 30 through Col 12, line 64). The examiner is considering a "non-overrideable" advertisement to be an advertisement that is not able to be replaced by any

other advertisement. In the teachings of Marsh, this would be an advertisement with the highest possible priority value, in the highest priority queue. An advertisement with this priority would be “non-overrideable” based upon the teachings of Marsh.

- b. The applicant also argues that Marsh does not disclose “receiving a request from an advertiser to replace any overrideable advertisement with another advertisement. However, when an advertiser requests to place an advertisement with the service provider, the advertiser selects various criteria affecting the priority of the advertisement. Once the criteria are selected and the advertiser pays for the advertisement space, the advertisement will replace any advertisement that contains a lower priority. Therefore, the advertiser has requested to replace any overrideable advertisement with their advertisement.

### ***Conclusion***

- 7 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

Art Unit: 3622


is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Van Bramer whose telephone number is (571) 272-8198. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5pm Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
jvb

  
ERIC W. STAMBER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600